

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending and have been amended.

Claims 4, 7-9, 13, 16, 17, and 21 have been amended solely for cosmetic reasons, putting them in more typical U.S. language. The other claims have been cosmetically amended, too, but they have also been amended to clarify that a portable communications device exchanges analog video signals with an external video apparatus.

Claims 1-8 and 10-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0085263 to Kim et al. ("Kim"), and claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over a combination of Kim and U.S. Patent No. 6,915,119 to Konishi ("Konishi"). These rejections should be reconsidered and withdrawn because neither Kim nor the combination of Kim and Konishi discloses all of the claimed features.

As mentioned above and as explained in the application on pages 2 and 3 for example, the invention provides a digital portable communications device that can exchange analog video signals with external video apparatuses and that is thus not limited to apparatuses adapted to a specific digital video signal protocol. This is advantageous at least because there is still much video equipment, such as standard TV receivers, computer monitors, and standard video cameras, which is not adapted to receive or transmit video signals in any of the digital formats.

Kim shows a mobile video phone having a camera unit 2, a phone unit 4, a display 8, and an interface unit 6 between the phone unit 4 and the display 8. Paragraph 0021, FIG. 1. The interface 6 conditions digital signal signals from a digital signal processor 18 in the camera 2 and digital signals from a portable phone controller 32 in the phone 4, multiplexing the digital signals together before providing them to the display 8. An RS232C interface 38 in the phone 4 enables the phone to exchange digital signals with a personal computer. Paragraph 38.

The camera 2 includes an analog to digital converter 16 and the interface 6 appears to include a digital to analog converter 41, but it must be recognized that these conversions and the resulting signals in Kim are used only internally in the mobile video phone. No analog signals are exchanged with or even available to an external video apparatus. (The display 8 is not such an external video apparatus at least because it

receives only digital signals from the interface 6, as pointed out above.) The only possibility of connecting the Kim's mobile video phone to an external device (other than the radio connection to the network) is the RS232C interface 38, which is without doubt a device that exchanges digital signals, not analog signals as claimed.

Because Kim fails to disclose at least a converter configured for at least one of providing analog video signals to the external video apparatus and receiving analog video signals from the external video apparatus as required by claim 1, for example, Kim fails to anticipate that claim. The other independent claim 10 includes a similar recitation, and thus Kim also fails to anticipate that claim. Almost needless to say, Kim thus fails to anticipate any of the dependent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the anticipation rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

With respect to the obviousness rejection of claim 9, Konishi describes a telephone and data transmitting method for a telephone, but Konishi does not disclose anything like the claimed subject matter that involves providing analog video signals to an external video apparatus and receiving analog video signals from the external video apparatus as described above.

Thus, because any combination of Kim and Konishi does not disclose all of the features required by dependent claim 9, Kim and Konishi fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness, which requires such disclosure. In view of the significant differences between the subject matter defined by claim 9 and the combination of Kim and Konishi, it is believed to be unnecessary to discuss the other two requirements for a *prima facie* case that are also missing here. Suffice it to say that the obviousness rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

It is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of same is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned attorney may be telephoned at the number given below.

Potomac Patent Group PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
Tel: 919 928 9979
Filed August 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
/Michael G. Savage/
Michael G. Savage
Registration No. 32,596